City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 24.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 29, 2007

DEPARTMENT: PLANNIN	G & DEVELO	PMENT		
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO	O WHEELER		□ Consent	⊠ Discussion
SUBJECT: ABEYANCE - GPA-24489 APPLICANT/OWNER: RAN Southeast Sector Plan of the (MEDIUM DENSITY RESID and Rancho Drive (APN 139-1	NCHO ALLE General Plan F ENTIAL) on 2	N, LLC - Request to FROM: SC (SERVICE 4.14 acres at the south	Amend a COMMER	portion of the CIAL) TO: M
APPLICANT REQUEST DECEMBER 20, 2007 PL				EE TO THE
PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE: APPROVALS I		APPROVALS REC	CEIVED BE	FORE:
Planning Commission Mtg.	11	Planning Commissi	on Mtg.	3
City Council Meeting	0	City Council Meetin	ng	0
RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL				
 BACKUP DOCUMENTATION Location and Aerial Maps Conditions (Not Applicable Supporting Documentation Photos 		ort (Not Applicable)		
5. Justification Letter				
6. Protest Postcards, Telephon7. Submitted after final agenda			rews & Inge	rsoll I.P for
Items 24-28		t by Danard Spain 7 ma	icus & mge	

Motion made by DAVID STEINMAN to Table Items 24-28

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0 GLENN TROWBRIDGE, DAVID STEINMAN, STEVEN EVANS, LEO DAVENPORT, BYRON GOYNES, RICHARD TRUESDELL, SAM DUNNAM; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

See Item 5 for related discussion.

City of Las Vegas Agenda Item No.: 24.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 29, 2007

MICHAEL RAMIREZ, 3311 West Coran Lane, appeared in opposition and expressed concern with the variance. CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT assured him that he would be notified if and when the project was heard again.

CORINA WELLS, 300 South 4th Street, appeared on behalf of the applicant and requested that the items be tabled as the project was being redesigned. She invited the neighbors to call her office if they had any questions.

DANIEL TORRES, 3311 West Coran Lane, expressed concern with the density and the possible three-story building.

MARGO WHEELER, Director of the Planning and Development Department, noted the applicant was requesting the items be tabled, but she recommended the items be stricken. She explained that either action would require notification of the project's next hearing, but a motion to strike would not require additional action by the Commissioners while a motion to table would need a motion to take it off the table.

MS. WELLS requested the items be tabled as she was uncomfortable with striking the applications and her client was expecting the items to be tabled.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY JAMES LEWIS briefly explained the Commissioners options in addressing the applicant's request.